

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,113	03/15/2002	Juerg Lareida	000364.00124 8075	
	7590 02/09/2007		EXAMINER	
James J Napoli Marshall Gerstein & Borun 6300 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606-6357			KIM, JENNIFER M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commons	10/088,113	LAREIDA, JUERO	LAREIDA, JUERG				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
·	Jennifer Kim	1617					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence ac	ddress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Ci after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a roon. Beriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this of the company o					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	11 Santambar 2006 11/21/20/	06					
· _ · · · _ ·		70 .					
· <u>/</u> /_	<u>, </u>						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
closed in accordance with the practice dis	dei Ex parte Quayle, 1900 C.D	. 11, 400 O.G. 210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 2.3,5,7,8,15 and 16 is/are pendir	ng in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) 2,3,5,7,8, 15, 16 is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to	• •	-					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the α	= • •	• •	FR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received.						
<u> </u>	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the			Stage				
application from the International Br	•		_				
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not	received.					
	•						
Attachmans/a\							
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A\	Summony (DTO 442)					
7) ☑ Notice of References Cited (P10-692) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Upon reconsideration, the 1.131 Declaration filed on September 11, 2006 has been considered and is deemed to overcome the 103 rejection over Du Bois (U.S.Patent No. 6,399,601B1) in view of Ratsimamanga et al. (U.S.Patent No. 5,972,342) and further in view of Clary et al. (U.S.Patent No. 5,753,225). The Finality is withdrawn. Prosecution is reopened upon a finding of new grounds of rejection as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brewer et al. (XP-000991091) of record.

Brewer et al. teach that sildenafil citrate therapy in men with Parkinson's Disease (a degenerative neuropathy) is effective in men with minimal side effects. Brewer et al. teach that the male patients with Parkinson's disease has been treated with 50 to 100mg of sildenafil citrate. (abstract).

Art Unit: 1617

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doherty, Jr. et al. (U.S.Patent No. 6,037,346) in view of de Tejada (U.S. Patent No. 6,277,884 B1).

Doherty, Jr. et al. teach a method for treating **erectile dysfunctions** in a mammalian male individual comprising administering a phosphodiesterase inhibitor including **sildenafil citrate (VIAGRA)** or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, ester, amide or derivative thereof within the context of an effective dosing regimen. (abstract). (column 3, lines 21-25). Doherty, Jr. et al. teach the effective daily dosage of the phosphodiesterase inhibitor in the range of approximately **0.1 to 500 mg**. (column 14, lines 15-25). This dosage range encompasses Applicant's range set forth in claim 5. 7

Art Unit: 1617

and 8. Doherty, Jr. et al. teach that the erectile dysfunction have been identified as neurogenic associated with peripheral neuropathy caused by diabetes. (column 1,

Page 4

lines 45-56).

Doherty, Jr. et al. do not teach that the erectile dysfunction patients are "in need"

of treating neuropathies.

de Tejada teaches that the sexual dysfunctions are attributable to **neuropathy**.

(column 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the patient

suffering from erectile dysfunction treated by sildenafil citrate taught in Doherty Jr. et

al's are in "need" of treating neuropathy because erectile dysfunction condition

attributes to neuropathy as taught by de Tejada. One would have been motivated to

employ sildenafil in patient suffering from erectile dysfunction that are "in need" of

treating neuropathy in order to avoid possible complications result from the sexual

dysfunction. There is a reasonable expectation of successfully treating erectile

dysfunction patient disclosed by Doherty, Jr. et al. who are "in need" of this treatment of

neuropathy because erectile dysfunction attributes to further complication of

neuropathy.

None of the claims are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1617

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 15 and 16 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-0628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 3 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer Kim Patent Examiner Art Unit 1617

Art Unit: 1617

Page 6

Jmk January 15, 2007